

**STATE OF RHODE ISLAND CITY OF EAST PROVIDENCE
COUNTY OF PROVIDENCE ZONING BOARD OF REVIEW**

MINUTES

A meeting of the East Providence Zoning Board of Review was held at 7:00 P.M., on Wednesday, 2 December 2015, in the City Council Chambers, East Providence City Hall.

The following members were present:

Eugene Saveory – Chairman

Michael Beauparlant – Vice-Chairman

John Braga

Pier-Mari Toledo

Antonio H. Cunha

Richard Croke, Sr. – 1st Alternate

Gary Pascoa – 2nd Alternate

Edward Pimentel – Zoning Officer / Clerk

Gregory Dias – Assistant City Solicitor

Chairman Saveory announces that it is the policy of the Zoning Board of Review to caution all petitioners that they have the right to counsel before the Board and failure to do so at this time does not constitute sufficient grounds for a change in circumstances under the

eighteen-month repetitive petition clause. All petitioners are also cautioned that if the petition is approved, all construction must be done in compliance with the submitted plan(s), application and testimony presented to the Zoning Board of Review. A change of any sought must obtain the requisite approval of the Zoning Board of Review. All work that deviates from the approval will be ordered halted and promptly removed. Comments will be limited to the petition being heard and no comments will be heard that do not pertain to an item scheduled on tonight's docket. He also notes that it is the policy of the Board that no new agenda item will be heard after 10:30 PM.

Chairman Saveory also notes that the Board welcomes any commentary from the public provided it solely pertains to an item on tonight's docket.

A. Swearing in of the Zoning Officer

Chairman Saveory asks Assistant City Solicitor Dias to swear in the Zoning Officer, Mr. Pimentel.

II. SEATING OF ALTERNATE MEMBERS

Chairman Saveory announces that all members are present.

III. APPROVAL OF ZONING BOARD MINUTES

Chairman Saveory asks for approval of the 10 June 2015, Zoning Board of Review Minutes. Motion by Ms. Toledo to approve the 10 June 2015, Zoning Board of Review Minutes. The motion is Seconded by Mr. Beauparlant, and Unanimously approved.

IV. ZONING OFFICER'S REPORT

Chairman Saveory announces that there is no report this month.

V. CORRESPONDENCE / DISCUSSION

Chairman Saveory announces that there are neither any correspondence nor items for discussion.

VI. STAFF REPORTS

A. Planning Department Staff Report – 24 November 2015 - Previously Submitted.

B. Complaint Report – November 2015 – Previously Submitted.

Chairman Saveory announces that the referenced documents are already rendered part of the official record.

VII. CONTINUED BUSINESS

1A. Petition No. 6602: David Allen (RFMCR Waterman Avenue, LLC), seeks permission to Waive submission of a Class I Survey, for property located at 855 – 865 Waterman Avenue, being Map 507, Block 01, Parcel 004.00, and located within an Industrial 1 District.

1B. Petition No. 6602: David Allen (RFMCR Waterman Avenue, LLC), seeks a Use Variance, to permit introduction of a religious institution, otherwise deemed a prohibited land use within the Industrial 1 District, pursuant to Section 19-98 ‘Schedule of Use Regulations’, for property located at 855 – 865 Waterman Avenue, being Map 507, Block 01, Parcel 004.00, and located within an Industrial 1 District.

Zoning Officer informs the Board that negotiations between the applicant (tenant) and property owner have faltered and therefore now formally requesting a withdrawal without prejudice.

Motion by Mr. Braga to permit the withdrawal of the petition of David Allen without prejudice. The motion is Seconded by Ms. Toledo, and Unanimously approved.

2A. Petition No. 6605: Mark A. Shaw, seeks a Special Use Permit, to permit expansion of a non-conforming two-unit residence, for property located at 138 Martin Street, being Map 208, Block 14, Parcel 009.00, and located within a Residential 3 District.

2B. Petition No. 6606: Mark A. Shaw, seeks a Dimensional Variance, to permit expansion of an accessory garage, without complying with the requisite accessory side-yard setback requirement, for property located at 138 Martin Street, being Map 208, Block 14, Parcel 009.00, and located within a Residential 3 District.

Zoning Officer informs the Board that the applicant did not submit the necessary materials in a timely manner to realize proper noticing, and therefore must be automatically continued.

Motion by Ms. Toledo to continue the subject petition to the 6 January 2016, scheduled meeting of the Zoning Board of Review. The motion is Seconded by Mr. Braga, and Unanimously approved.

VIII. NEW BUSINESS

1A. Petition No. 6608: Sandra DeLuca, seeks permission to Waive submission of a Class I Survey, for property located at 110 Crown Avenue, being Map 309, Block 04, Parcel 018.00, and located within a

Residential 3 District.

1B. Petition No. 6609: Sandra DeLuca, seeks a Dimensional Variance, to permit retention of a deck that was constructed without the benefit of a building permit and violates the requisite side-yard setback requirement, pursuant to Section 19-145 'Dimensional Regulations' for property located at 110 Crown Avenue, being Map 309, Block 04, Parcel 018.00, and located within a Residential 3 District.

Zoning Officer informs the Board that the applicant's counsel inadvertently noted the incorrect parcel number of the petition, and therefore both the advertising and noticing are in error. This process will need to be repeated, and the petition must therefore be continued.

Motion by Ms. Toledo to continue the subject petition to the 6 January 2016, scheduled meeting of the Zoning Board of Review. The motion is Seconded by Mr. Cunha, and Unanimously approved.

2. Petition No. 6607: James R. Gorniewicz, seeks a Use Variance, to permit retention of a prohibited two-unit residence, otherwise deemed a prohibited land use within the Residential 3 District, pursuant to Section 19-98 'Schedule of Use Regulations' for property located at 76 Beach Point Drive, being Map 513, Block 59, Parcel 004.00, and located within a Residential 4 District.

James R. Gorniewicz, 76 Beach Point Drive, East Providence, RI, subject petitioner, is properly sworn in.

Mr. Gorniewicz informs the Board that his initial plan when he first designed the residence was to get married and raise a family. That did not materialize, and therefore he had several friends and acquaintances over the years occupy some of the premises. Presently, his aunt occupies the second-floor. They both equally share all spaces and she does use the first-floor kitchen area. His objective tonight is to seek permission to retain a second-floor kitchenette so that she may remain self-sufficient. She is a semi-retired nurse. There is more than sufficient on-site parking. There are several similar two-unit residences within the subject neighborhood.

Chairman Saveory queries the Board, commencing with Mr. Cunha.

Mr. Cunha inquires as to where the Aunt is presently residing? Mr. Gorniewicz responds that she is residing on the second-floor.

Mr. Cunha inquires if the proposed kitchen will be located on the second-floor as well? Mr. Gorniewicz responds in the affirmative.

Mr. Cunha inquires as to means of ingress and egress to the

property. Mr. Gorniewicz responds that there is an individual entrance that opens up to a foyer, and then to the individual floors.

Mr. Pascoa responds that he does not have any questions and/or comments at this time.

Mr. Croke inquires as to who presently resides on the first-floor. Mr. Gorniewicz responds that it is both himself and his girl-friend.

Mr. Croke inquires if the Aunt has her own personal full bathroom on the second-floor? Mr. Gorniewicz responds in the affirmative.

Mr. Croke notes for the record that what the petitioner is requesting is to formally convert the subject property to a two-unit residence. Mr. Gorniewicz responds in the affirmative.

Mr. Croke acknowledges that the petitioner has more than sufficient off-street parking, however it occupies the entire front-yard detracting from the appearance of both the subject property as well as surrounding neighborhood. Mr. Gorniewicz explains that he over-extended himself on the construction of the residence, however does intend on finishing off the driveway area.

Mr. Croke notes that the property is quite substandard, and therefore seeking a second-unit seems somewhat unreasonable.

Ms. Toledo inquires as to the presence of a second-floor kitchen? Mr. Gorniewicz responds that there is solely a sink area.

Ms. Toledo inquires if the second-floor has ever been previously rented? Mr. Gorniewicz reiterates that he had roommates.

Ms. Toledo inquires as to the presence of alternate points of egress? Mr. Gorniewicz responds that there are sliders on both floors.

Mr. Braga inquires as to when the second-floor sink was introduced? Mr. Gorniewicz responds that it has been approximately 2.5-years.

Mr. Braga inquires about the presence of a stove? Mr. Gorniewicz responds that the second-floor has never been improved with a stove.

Mr. Braga inquires about the presence of a refrigerator? Mr. Gorniewicz responds that it has always had a small refrigerator.

Mr. Braga inquires as to how long following the prior zoning hearing was the second-floor occupied by someone other than himself? Mr. Gorniewicz responded that it was approximately two-years after construction that he had a friend reside in the property.

Mr. Braga inquires if his friends resided with him on the first-floor? Mr. Gorniewicz responds that they were always located on the

second-floor.

Mr. Braga inquires as to the bedroom layout? Mr. Gorniewicz responds that there are two (2) bedrooms on the first-floor, and one (1) on the second-floor.

Mr. Braga notes for the record that he is in full agreement with Mr. Croke. The petitioner previously acknowledged that there was never any intent to introduce a two-unit residence. Mr. Gorniewicz responds that his family plans changed, and now he is simply attempting to help a family member.

Mr. Beauparlant inquires about the layout of the lower (basement) level? Mr. Gorniewicz responds that the original half is still improved as it always was. The other half is improved with a full bathroom.

Chairman Saveory notes for the record that the Board has evidence of a Mr. White renting the second-floor. Mr. Gorniewicz acknowledges that that is correct.

Chairman Saveory reiterates Mr. Croke's and Mr. Cunha's comments, considering all three (3) of them were present during the initial zoning hearing back in the early 2000s. The property was acknowledged as being quite substandard, as was the bungalow style residence that occupied the property. Although, they understood that reasonable living area was appropriate, they were all fearful given the proposed

size of the residence that it would be used other than for single-family purposes. There may have been the presence of hardship initially due to the substandard size of the glorified beach house. However, hardship is simply no longer present. Furthermore, at that time, Mr. Cunha was quite adamant about the rather sizeable nature of the proposed residence and possible attempt to introduce a second prohibited unit. He too shared that concern at that time. Mr. Gorniewicz responds that he will no longer permit residence by any friends or acquaintances. He is simply trying to assist his aunt.

Chairman Saveory notes for the record had the petitioner acknowledged his true intentions during the initial hearing, namely introduction of a two-unit residence, he is rather confident that it would have been denied.

Mr. Cunha reiterates his concerns, and then inquires as to why a second kitchen is required if it is all interchangeably used by family members – they can share the first-floor kitchen. Mr. Gorniewicz responds that it provides some degree of privacy and independence.

Mr. Cunha inquires as to how there can be independence and privacy of the ingress and egress is free-flowing. Mr. Gorniewicz explains that once entering the common foyer, there is separation with doors to each floor. Mr. Cunha concludes that this has already been configured as a two-unit, regardless of whether a kitchen is, or is not, present on the second-floor. Furthermore, the so-called friends /

acquaintances have been living in an independent apartment. Mr. Gorniewicz acknowledges that that is correct.

Chairman Saveory inquires if there is anyone present who would like to speak in favor of the subject petition. Hearing and seeing none, Chairman Saveory inquires if there is anyone present who would like to speak against the subject petition.

Cynthia Ray, 52 Beach Point Drive, East Providence, RI, requests permission to speak against the subject petition. Ms. Ray is properly sworn in.

Ms. Ray informs the Board that she also owns the property addressed 44 – 46 North Shore Road.

Ms. Ray informs the Board that she has been selected as the spokesperson for the neighborhood, and will therefore be speaking on their behalf for brevity purposes.

Ms. Ray informs the Board that the neighborhood is quite concerned about the retention of the referenced two-unit residence. However, she would first like to point out some discrepancies. First of all, the prepared Radius Map is incorrect, referencing the wrong parcel. The second error is in regard to the zoning application. The applicant is seeking permission to retain a two-unit residence – as evidenced by both the zoning advertisement and notices – and yet, the application

references retention of a multi-unit residence. Zoning Officer responds that the referenced radius map error was in regard to the previous submission – the one that was withdrawn without prejudice. The present submission resulted in the preparation of a new corrected radius map and notice. As for the application, that is simply an error on the part of the petitioner who did not understand the process. The Board understands that it is a two-unit were discussing, and not a multi-unit. Both advertisement and notices reflect the correct request.

Mr. Braga notes for the record that the referenced error resulted in more people be noticed that otherwise required.

Ms. Ray continues by referencing the facts of the prior zoning approval, in which the Board expressed concern about the size of the proposed single-family residence and potential for introducing a two-unit dwelling. The petitioner made it clear that that was not his intention. He has since violated that approval and is requesting to bless his illegal actions. The applicant has even failed to submit a proper application, providing no argument as to why he is entitled to maintaining the illegally introduced two-unit dwelling. As for existing neighborhood conditions, some are pre-existing and others are not as described. Regardless, the applicant already received a benefit from the Board and is now, per personal actions, seeking something he is absolutely not entitled to. There is no grounds for the granting of a use variance. Anything other than a single-family will have a

detrimental impact on the immediate property owners. She is also concerned about the inclusion of additional vehicles, given existing roadway configuration constraints, and the ability of emergency vehicles to maneuver through the neighborhood. She would request that not only the second-floor unit be denied and any associated improvements and utilities be removed, but the same be imposed upon the basement area.

Chairman Saveory then inquires if there is anyone else present who would like to speak against the subject petition.

Patricia Poissant, 54 Beach Point Drive, East Providence, RI, requests permission to speak against the subject petition. Ms. Poissant is properly sworn in.

Ms. Poissant reiterates the neighborhood concern regarding the present roadway configuration and the increase in traffic as more and more vehicles are introduced. The neighborhood is already congested, and it is inappropriate to realize even greater density.

Chairman Saveory then inquires if there is anyone else present who would like to speak against the subject petition.

Dianna Poissant, 59 Beach Point Drive, East Providence, RI, requests permission to speak against the subject petition. Ms. Poissant is properly sworn in.

Ms. Poissant reiterates the neighborhood's concern regarding the neighborhood congestion, especially in regard to the associated increase in vehicles and traffic.

Ms. Ray concludes her presentation by noting that there is evidence in the record, namely in the form of rental receipts and agreement(s) regarding the rental nature of the subject unit.

Mr. Gorniewicz responds to some of the criticisms by noting that he has never resulted in on-street parking. He is perhaps one of the few properties that has more than sufficient off-street parking. In fact, the property diagonally across the street always has a vehicle on the street, even though he has a driveway.

Roland Poissant, 59 Beach Point Drive, East Providence, RI, requests permission to speak against the subject petition. Mr. Poissant is properly sworn in.

Mr. Poissant responds to Mr. Gorniewicz's comment, noting that he is the property just referenced. He parks his vehicle on the street at times, so that when a family members visits they have the ability to park on the street. This reduces the overall movement of vehicles, and their need to park some distance from the property. It is a matter of convenience.

Chairman Saveory then inquires if there is anyone else present who would like to speak against the subject petition. Hearing and seeing none, Chairman Saveory queries the Board for a motion.

Motion by Mr. Cunha, based on all the evidence and testimony presented to the Zoning Board of Review and the personal knowledge of the members of the Board of the land and area of the City of East Providence, the Zoning Board hereby finds:

- 1. That the use is not compatible with neighboring land uses.**
- 2. That the use will create a nuisance in the neighborhood.**
- 3. That the use will hinder the future development of the City.**
- 4. That the use does not conform to all applicable sections of the use requested.**
- 5. That the use is not in conformance with the purpose and intent of the East Providence Comprehensive Plan and applicable standards of this Chapter.**

Mr. Cunha moves that the use variance be Denied. Mr. Cunha notes that the petitioner adamantly agreed not to introduce a second unit if he were given the right to expand the then rather substandard residence. Whatever hardship as was associated with the property

has long been cured. There is no longer any evidence of any hardship.

The motion is Seconded by Mr. Beauparlant.

Roll Call Vote:

Mr. Cunha - Aye For reasons just stated.

Ms. Toledo - Aye This is clear evidence that the second unit was being used

for rental purposes, and not simply to help a friend and/or relative. She then quotes directly from testimony provided by the petitioner during the previous zoning approval.

Mr. Braga - Aye Any associated hardship would have been resolved during

the previous approval. Furthermore, the petitioner was asked in direct examination what his intentions were and he clearly responded that it was for single, and not, two-unit purposes.

Mr. Beauparlant - Aye Two-unit is not compatible with the neighborhood.

Furthermore, the proposed use is incompatible with the subject property. It will result in a neighborhood nuisance and negatively impact the surrounding character. Finally, the petitioner was granted prior relief and is therefore enjoying full beneficial use of the property.

Chairman Saveory - Aye Basing it on early statements. There is simply no hardship

Associated with the subject petition. Not conducive to the Neighborhood and will therefore negatively impact it.

Use Variance unanimously denied.

3. Petition No. 6610: Ronald and Catherine E. Moore, seek a Use Variance, to permit retention of a prohibited three-unit residence, otherwise deemed a prohibited land use within the Residential 6 District, pursuant to Section 19-98 'Schedule of Use Regulations' for property located at 25 Berkeley Street, being Map 206, Block 28, Parcel 009.00, and located within a Residential 6 District.

[NOTE: The Zoning Board of Review unanimously waived the submission of a Class I Survey, concluding that no exterior changes were either proposed or anticipated. The applicant had already documented more than sufficient off-street parking – required four (4) spaces – a long-term condition that did not require any expansion. Mandating submission of a Class I Survey would incur an unnecessary expense, considering no exterior changes were necessary.]

Ronald Moore, 31 Bluff Street, East Providence, RI, subject petitioner, is properly sworn in.

Mr. Moore informs the Board that he has owned the property addressed 25 Berkeley Street, for upwards of 30-years. He was led to believe when he initially purchased that it was a legal three-unit dwelling. In fact, it has been sold twice prior to his ownership, and it appears to have been a continued three-unit dwelling throughout that period. He was preparing to sell the property for purposes of assisting in his retirement. It was actually sold, and could not obtain the Certificate of Zoning, being informed that it is an illegal three-unit.

The sale has since been lost. What most concerns him, is the number of opportunities that the City has had to correct the illegality. Not only has been the property repeatedly reevaluated by the Tax Assessment Department, but also during the obtainment of permits. He has well documented the presence of the three-unit with both Departments. He has also explored the Polk Directories, and it appears to evidence the presence of a multi-unit as far back as 1965. The Fire Department inspected the property as recently as two-years ago when he hard-wired the entire structure, and there was no concern expressed regarding any illegality. Also he has properly obtained electrical and mechanical permits during this period. He also has lost quite a bit of value. Finally, he has investigated other similar multi-unit residences on substandard lots throughout the City, and there does not appear to be any related concern.

Mr. Beauparlant responds by noting that there is clearly many pre-existing land uses throughout the City, however they have no bearing on the subject petition. The Board can only consider the

facts surrounding the subject property itself. Zoning Officer concurs, reiterating Mr. Beauparlant's comments

Zoning Officer then informs the Board that Mr. Moore is correct on several points. He cannot evidence the presence of three-unit since 1965, as testified, however can evidence its presence since minimally the early 1970s. There is a zoning decision dating back to 1968, in which the then property owner who owned the adjacent lot, solely documented the presence of a single-family dwelling. That is a legal document that the Zoning Officer must accept as being a correct representation of the then legal use. Therefore, there is only two (2) possible outcomes. The first possibility is that the then property owner lied, desiring not to document true usage, less it result in a denial of permitting development of the second lot. The second possibility, is that it was illegally converted directly subsequent to the zoning approval. There is vast evidence of the presence of a three-unit dwelling, including tax assessment reevaluation and obtainment of various permits. Although, a tax assessment cannot evidence legality of land usage, it is a tool that may be used to assist in that endeavor. He did offer to legalize two (2) of the units, because back then you could introduce a two-unit on a 5,000 square foot parcel, however had no legal authority to bless the three-unit. Only the Zoning Board of Review has the authority to permit retention of the three-unit residence. He would agree with the petitioner that the City is partly responsible and therefore retention may be the appropriate decision. However, he has made the owner repeatedly

aware that a zoning approval, does not bless the third-unit in regard to both building and/or fire code. There are no associated grand-fathered rights in regard to code compliance. He would therefore request that any approval the Board sees fit to grant, be conditioned on obtaining whatever building and/or fire approvals are necessary to render compliance with current codes. A final recommendation is in regard to the need for submission of a Class I Survey plan. He actually recommends that it be waived. The present driveway appears to be dated, and can more than accommodate the requisite minimum four (4) off-street parking spaces. There would be no need to mandate submission, since no exterior changes are either proposed or even required.

Mr. Braga inquires if the Board should first address the request for a Waiver of the Class I Surveyed Site Plan submission? Zoning Officer responds in the affirmative.

Chairman Saveory queries the Board, commencing with Mr. Cunha.

Mr. Braga notes for the record that he concurs with both the petitioner's as well as Zoning Officer's comments, regarding fault, none of which pertains to the present property owner. In fact, in some ways the City dropped the ball. He is therefore inclined to permit the present owner the right to retain all three units.

Mr. Beauparlant notes that he concurs with Mr. Braga's comments.

Mr. Cunha notes for the record that he does not have any questions.

Ms. Toledo likewise concurs with the Board's sentiment.

Chairman Saveory likewise notes his support subject to obtaining whatever building and/or fire code approvals are necessary.

Mr. Pascoa notes that he too concurs with the Board's sentiment.

Mr. Croke notes that he too believes the City dropped the ball. There is numerous evidence on the record regarding the presence of the three-unit, and this property owner should not suffer the consequences.

Chairman Saveory inquires if there is anyone present who would like to speak in favor of the subject petition. Hearing and seeing none, Chairman Saveory inquires if there is anyone present who would like to speak against the subject petition. Hearing and seeing none, Chairman Saveory queries the Board for a motion.

Motion by Mr. Braga to waiver the submission of a Class I Survey. The motion is Seconded by Mr. Beauparlant, and Unanimously approved. The Board agrees that there would be no benefit to said submission, considering there is no exterior changes proposed or required. It would be an undue expense on the petitioner.

Motion by Mr. Braga, based on all the evidence and testimony presented to the Zoning Board of Review and the personal knowledge of the members of the Board of the land and area of the City of East Providence, the Zoning Board hereby finds:

- 1. That the use is compatible with neighboring land uses.**
- 2. That the use will not create a nuisance in the neighborhood.**
- 3. That the use will not hinder the future development of the City.**
- 4. That the use does conform to all applicable sections of the use requested.**
- 5. That the use is in conformance with the purpose and intent of the East Providence Comprehensive Plan and applicable standards of this Chapter.**

Mr. Braga moves that the use variance be Granted subject to the petitioner fulfilling the following conditions:

- 1. Compliance with all pertinent Building Code and Fire Code regulations. The subject review and approval solely addressed zoning related issues, and in no way grand-fathered the subject three-unit residence from any other applicable regulations.**

2. Petitioner(s) obtaining any, and all, necessary permits.

3. Strict compliance with the submitted site plan (or amended site plan as it may be applicable), all exhibits, and entire testimony provided during the respective hearing.

Chairman Saveory asks Mr. Moore if he accepts the conditions of approval just stipulated, understanding that strict compliance means that any deviation will necessitate revisiting the Zoning Board of Review, said revisit may be requested by either the Zoning Officer or any member of the Zoning Board of Review. Mr. Moore responds that he fully understands and accepts the conditions just stipulated.

The motion is Seconded by Mr. Beauparlant.

Roll Call Vote:

Mr. Braga - Aye The use has been present for such a long period that

it would be difficult to believe that it is either a neighborhood detriment or hindrance to the City.

He would also note that the City has some degree of culpability.

Mr. Beauparlant - Aye Concurs with Mr. Braga's comments.

Mr. Cunha - Aye

Ms. Toledo - Aye Concurs with the Board's sentiment.

Chairman Saveory - Aye

Use variance unanimously granted, subject to the aforementioned condition(s).

IX. PROCEDURES

Chairman Saveory announces that the Board needs to ratify next year's hearing schedule.

Zoning Officer informs the Board that the regular first Wednesday schedule works well for all months, except perhaps two. The schedule is discussed and amended accordingly – modified schedule being as follows:

ZONING BOARD OF REVIEW

2016 MEETIN SCHEDULE

6 JANUARY 2016 – Hearing Date

[11 December 2015 – Submission Deadline]

3 FEBRUARY 2016 – Hearing Date

[8 January 2016 – Submission Deadline]

2 MARCH 2016

[5 February 2016 – Submission Deadline]

6 APRIL 2016

[4 March 2016 – Submission Deadline]

4 MAY 2016

[1 April 2016 – Submission Deadline]

1 JUNE 2016

[6 May 2016 – Submission Deadline]

13 JULY 2016

[10 June 2016 – Submission Deadline]

3 AUGUST 2016

[8 July 2016 – Submission Deadline]

7 SEPTEMBER 2016

[5 August 2016 – Submission Deadline]

5 OCTOBER 2016

[2 September 2016 – Submission Deadline]

2 NOVEMBER 2016

[7 October 2016 – Submission Deadline]

7 DECEMBER 2016

[4 November 2016 – Submission Deadline]

11 JANUARY 2017

[9 December 2016 – Submission Deadline]

Motion by Ms. Toledo to approved the modified schedule. The motion is Seconded by Mr. Beauparlant, and Unanimously approved.

X. ANNOUNCEMENTS

Chairman Saveory announces that the next meeting of the Zoning Board of Review is scheduled for Wednesday, 6 January 2016, at 7:00 PM, in the City of East Providence Council Chambers, City Hall, East Providence, RI.

XI. ADJOURNMENT

Motion to adjourn by Mr. Braga. The motion is Seconded by Mr. Beauparlant and Unanimously voted to adjourn. Meeting is adjourned at 9:00 P.M.

Edward Pimentel, AICP

Zoning Officer / Clerk

Secretary